



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

c/c

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/877,209	06/08/2001	Jonathan S. Wolf	3186.1000-001	9526
21005	7590	06/13/2005	EXAMINER	
HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C. 530 VIRGINIA ROAD P.O. BOX 9133 CONCORD, MA 01742-9133			PARTHASARATHY, PRAMILA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2136	

DATE MAILED: 06/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/877,209

Applicant(s)

WOLF ET AL.

Examiner

Pramila Parthasarathy

Art Unit

2136

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,30,31,33,34,66-69 and 76-79 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,30,31,33,34,66-69 and 76-79 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/18/2005
- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 05/18/2005
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is a supplemental Examiner's Amendment further in response to Examiner initiated call to the applicant regarding the Information Disclosure Statement on May 18, 2005.
2. Claims 1, 2, 4, 33 and 34 were amended. Claims 3, 5 – 29, 32, 35 – 65 and 70 – 75 were cancelled. New claims 76 – 79 were added. Claims 1, 2, 4, 30, 31, 33, 34, 66 – 69 and 76 – 79 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on April 18, 2005 was filed after the mailing date of the Non-Final Rejection on November 02, 2004. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.
4. An initialed and dated copy of Applicant's IDS form 1449 is attached to the Office action.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed on February 04, 2005, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claim 1, 2, 4, 30, 31, 33, 34 and 76 – 79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the best mode contemplated by the inventor has not been disclosed. Evidence of concealment of the best mode is based upon generating/receiving “configuration file” and “configlets”.

Applicant's specification discloses “a network configuration management system includes a policy engine which generates configlets based onand a selected device to be configured. The configlets can be vendor-neutral, vendor-specific, or both.”, and “The policy engine constructs for the containment of policies.” (Instant application Page 4 lines 4 – 15).

Independent Claims 1 and 78 do not explicitly state how the configuration files are generated or received and do not disclose “a policy engine which generates

configlets” and “a translator/combiner to translate and combine the configlets to form vendor-dependent configuration files”.

7. Claims 1, 2, 4, 30, 31, 33, 34 and 76 – 79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The amended independent and new Claims 1 and dependent new Claim 79 read, “...a configuration file generator configured ...”.

With respect to “a configuration file generator”, although the specification discloses “A device configuration file is generally an ASCII text file ...or a set of lower level instructions, e.g., SNMP commands.”, the specification does not disclose a configuration file generator (Instant application Page 4 lines 1 – 6). The specification does not indicate how the configuration generator configured to generate a second vendor-specific configuration file.

Applicant’s amendment does not clarify the steps of configuration generator configured to generate a second vendor-specific configuration file and does not direct to show any support in the specification.

For Examining purposes, “a configuration file generator” is broadly interpreted as a policy translator that generates a configuration file.

Art Unit: 2136

8. The dependent claims 2, 4, 30, 31, 33, 34 and 76 – 79 are rejected at least by virtue of their dependency on the dependent claim.

9. Regarding amended independent Claim 1, applicant argued that the cited prior art Gai et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,167,445) does not disclose “a reverse translator ...”, and “a configuration file generator...”. This is not found persuasive.

Gai discloses implementing high level policies within a computer network having multiple, dissimilar network devices wherein the high-level policies are generally device (vendor) dependent and translated by one or more policy servers into a set of rules that can be applied by specific network devices.

Gai discloses a reverse translator (produces configlets, the results of policy evaluation that can be vendor-specific, vendor-neutral, or both, Instant application Page 4 lines 4 – 7 and Page 18 line 1 – Page 19 line 9) wherein the policy translator examines the high-level policy and the resulting information is stored (Gai Column 13 lines 63).

Furthermore, Gai discloses a configuration file generator configured to generate a second vendor-specific configuration file using the plurality of vendor-neutral configlets, the second vendor-specific configuration file corresponding to a second network device (Column 14 line 57 – Column 15 line 48).

10. Regarding new Claims 78 and 79, please refer to the response provided for Claim 1 above.

Art Unit: 2136

11. Regarding amended independent Claim 66, applicant argued that the cited prior art Gai et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,167,445) does not disclose “maintaining login information” and “the login information is not maintained at both the network device and at the configuration server”. This is not found persuasive.

Gai discloses “maintaining login information” and “maintaining login information in the network device and in the configuration server” (Column 12 lines 41 – 56 and Column 14 lines 3 – 33).

12. Therefore, the examiner respectfully asserts that the cited prior art does teach or suggest the subject matter “a reverse translator”, “a configuration file generator”, “maintaining login information” and “maintaining login information in the network device and in the configuration server”, broadly recited in the independent claims 1, 66 and 78. The dependent claims 2, 4, 30, 31, 33, 34, 67 – 69, 76, 77 and 79 are rejected at least by virtue of their dependency on the dependent claims and by other reason set forth in this office action.

13. Accordingly, the rejection for the pending claims 1, 2, 4, 30, 31, 33, 34, 66 – 69 and 76 – 79 is respectfully maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

14. Claims 1, 2, 4, 30, 31, 33, 34, 66, 68, 69 and 76 – 79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gai et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,167,445).

15. Regarding Claim 1, Gai teaches

a reverse translator configured to receive a first vendor-specific configuration file from a first network device and configured to reverse translate the first vendor-specific configuration file into at least one vendor-neutral configlet (Gai Column 13 lines 63);

a configuration file generator configured to generate a second vendor-specific configuration file using the at least one vendor-neutral configlet, the second vendor-specific configuration file corresponding to a second network device (Column 14 line 57 – Column 15 line 48); and

a loader for loading the second vendor-specific configuration file to the second network device (Column 13 lines 1 – 14; Column 14 line 64 - Column 15 line 42 and Column 19 lines 3 - 36).

wherein the first vendor-specific configuration file is usable to configure the operation of the first network device and the second vendor-specific configuration file is usable to configure the operation of the second network device (Column 13 line 63 - Column 14 line 23 and Column 17 line 33 - 48).

16. Regarding Claim 66, Gai teaches

maintaining login information for access to the device in the device and in a configuration server (Column 12 lines 41 – 56 and Column 14 lines 3 – 33),

maintaining, in the server, login information for access from a user to the server and device access rights for the user (Column 12 lines 41 – 56 and Column 14 lines 3 – 33); and

accessing the configuration setup of the device by a user through the server by the user accessing the server and the server accessing the device (Column 12 lines 41 – 67 and Column 13 line 63 – Column 14 line 23).

17. Regarding Claim 78, Gai teaches

a reverse translator configured to receive a first vendor-specific configuration file from a first network device and configured to reverse translate the first vendor-specific configuration tile into at least one vendor-neutral configlet (Gai Column 13 lines 63); and

a policy engine including a verification clause, the policy engine configured to verify the at least one vendor-neutral configlet against the verification clause (Column 15 line 5 - Column 16 line 20).

18. Claim 2 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Gai teaches a translator which translates the at least one vendor-neutral configlet to a vendor-specific configlet (Column 5 line 63- Column 6 line 26, Column 6 line 58 -

Art Unit: 2136

Column 7 line 10, Column 9 line 36 - Column 10 line 34 and Column 13 line 63 - Column 14 line 28).

19. Claim 4 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Gai teaches the plurality of vendor-neutral configlets are organized based on a selected feature set target level (Column 5 line 63 - Column 6 line 26; Column 6 line 58 - Column 7 line 10; Column 9 line 36 - Column 10 line 34 and Column 13 line 63- Column 14 line 28).

20. Claim 30 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Gai teaches wherein the system retains login information to the devices, such that a user desiring to connect to a device must log in to the system, the system connecting to the device (Column 11 lines 26 - 43 and Column 17 lines 3 - 19).

21. Claim 31 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Gai teaches wherein the system passes commands from the user to the device, and responses from the device to the user (Column 11 lines 26 - 43 and Column 17 lines 3 - 19).

22. Claims 33 and 76 are rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Gai teaches wherein at least one of said configuration files comprises a

Art Unit: 2136

full configuration (Column 7 line 55 - Column 8 line 25 and Column 16 line 44 - Column 17 line 19).

23. Claims 34 and 77 are rejected as applied above in rejecting claims 1 and 35.

Furthermore, Gai teaches wherein at least one of said configuration files comprises a partial configuration (Column 7 line 55 - Column 8 line 25 and Column 16 lines 44 – 47).

24. Claim 68 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Gai teaches monitoring communication between the user and the device (Column 19 line 63 - Column 20 line 9).

25. Claim 69 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Gai teaches recording communications between the user and the device (Column 5 line 63- Column 7 line 25 and Column 18 line 46 – Column 19 line 36).

26. As per Claim 79, Gai teaches

a configuration file generator configured to generate a second vendor-specific configuration file using the at least one vendor-neutral configlet, the second vendor-specific configuration file corresponding to a second network device (Column 14 line 57 – Column 15 line 48); and

a loader for loading the second vendor-specific configuration file to the second

Art Unit: 2136

network device (Column 13 lines 1 – 14; Column 14 line 64 - Column 15 line 42 and Column 19 lines 3 - 36).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

27. Claim 67 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gai et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,167,445, hereinafter, "Gai") in view of Rothermel et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,678,827, hereinafter, "Rothermel").

28. Claim 67 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Gai teaches that the device login information is maintained (Column 19 lines 43 - 56). Gai does not explicitly disclose that the maintained device login information is stored encrypted. However, Rothermel discloses using a manager device to remotely manage multiple network security devices wherein the maintained device login information is encrypted (Column 16 lines 24 - 59) to determine the level of security to provide access to the device or service. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Rothermel into the teachings of Gai to have a system wherein the device login

information is stored encrypted that provides access privileges and to block a hacker attack on the network devices.

Conclusion

29. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

30. Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant.

Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the

responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

31. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO Form 892.

Applicant is urged to consider the references. However, the references should be evaluated by what they suggest to one versed in the art, rather than by their specific disclosure. If applicants are aware of any better prior art than those are cited, they are required to bring the prior art to the attention of the examiner.


32. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pramila Parthasarathy whose telephone number is 571-272-3866. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00a.m. To 5:00p.m.. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-232-3795. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Art Unit: 2136

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Pramila Parthasarathy

May 24, 2005.


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100